

Date: Thu, 7 Oct 93 18:06:37 PDT  
From: Info-Hams Mailing List and Newsgroup <info-hams@ucsd.edu>  
Errors-To: Info-Hams-Errors@UCSD.Edu  
Reply-To: Info-Hams@UCSD.Edu  
Precedence: Bulk  
Subject: Info-Hams Digest V93 #1190  
To: Info-Hams

Info-Hams Digest                      Thu, 7 Oct 93                      Volume 93 : Issue 1190

Today's Topics:

70cm repeaters  
HTs Airlines and Morris  
Knight SpanMaster  
MOTOROLA  
Motorola ad in QST? (2 msgs)  
Multiband Wire Antenna  
New HF Rig  
New Products Announcement: BFH-1 & BFH-2  
PK88 Eprom TF23PK88 ZIP  
Rote Memorization (was: code tests)  
RS SWR meters?  
Speech Inversion Mod Needed  
Standards in 12V power cords.  
ZD9SXW & 3D2AW QSL routes?

Send Replies or notes for publication to: <Info-Hams@UCSD.Edu>  
Send subscription requests to: <Info-Hams-REQUEST@UCSD.Edu>  
Problems you can't solve otherwise to brian@ucsd.edu.

Archives of past issues of the Info-Hams Digest are available  
(by FTP only) from UCSD.Edu in directory "mailarchives/info-hams".

We trust that readers are intelligent enough to realize that all text  
herein consists of personal comments and does not represent the official  
policies or positions of any party. Your mileage may vary. So there.

-----

Date: Wed, 6 Oct 1993 18:47:37 GMT  
From: dog.ee.lbl.gov!agate!howland.reston.ans.net!vixen.cso.uiuc.edu!  
usenet.ucs.indiana.edu!silver.ucs.indiana.edu!djadams@network.ucsd.edu  
Subject: 70cm repeaters  
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

Greetings! I have a six channel 70cm HT I need to setup  
for useful frequencies, but don't know what these might be, so....  
if anyone knows of any 70cm repeaters in the Indianapolis, lafayette, bloomington,

and Crown Point/Merrilville areas here in IN, I'd appreciate knowing the in/out frequencies.

Dave  
73 de N9UXU

PS - does anyone know of any phone bbses in the Indy area, that are connected to and allow you to remotely operate the owners packet equipment? there is a nice one in Chicago (708-238-1901), but that is a little long distance to try out packet...

Dave

David J Adams Internet: djadams@silver.ucs.indiana.edu  
Amiga User and Flow Cytometry Advocate  
Looking for a Kenwood TS520s and a mobile 2m rig  
Conure Society of America. "Push the button Frank"

-----  
Date: Thu, 07 Oct 93 17:49:30 GMT  
From: netcon!bongo!skyld!jangus@locus.ucla.edu  
Subject: HTs Airlines and Morris  
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

In article <1993Oct4.142552.23058@cyphyn.radnet.com> randy@cyphyn.radnet.com >  
(Randy) writes:

> Using a transmitter....even many receivers ( the local oscillator, is why)  
> inside an aeroplane, you are right next to the antenna system...the body of  
> the craft is part of the system.  
>  
> Someone sending, or even receiving, will screw up the navigation gear,  
> (which relies heavily on radio), plus the collision avoidance systems.

Oh dear me! I will NEVER EVER again get on an airline. Apparently as little a few milliwatts of RF at the wrong frequency will cause the plane to plunge flaming into the ground.

On board a typical commercial airline there are several radios covering a wide spectrum from HF on up to SHF. All of the manufacturers are aware of the environment they have to operate in. Airlines certainly would not want the liability of operating susceptible navigation equipment or performing "instrument only" flight if they weren't VERY sure of the reliability.

When an aircraft heads west out of Los Angeles International, it heads right over Mt. Wilson.

Several hundred kilowatts of RF spread from DC to Daylight(tm).

Interesting to note that Mt. Wilson is not pockmarked with the craters of several thousand airplanes.

Denver Colorado has a similar situation with their commercial broadcasting site vs the airport. And it too seems remarkably unscathed as well.

How about that new windsheer radar. Several megawatts at 450 MHz straight up into the atmosphere. Boy howdy, that should be able to knock a plane clear out of the water (figuratively speaking of course) at 20,000 feet!

Now, I can understand the airlines wanting to cover themselves from a liability standpoint but not coming right out and stating, "We feel our airplanes are safe, see if you CAN knock it out of the air." I wouldn't want to encourage it either. I can also see the FAA (and others) taking a similarly preemptive stance. Especially since nowadays, it appears that people can sue the governemt for allowing mountain lions to live in the wilderness. (And win!)

I wonder how long before the pre-flight announcement includes removing any stray gravitrons so as not to mess with the altimeter. (Insert dumb smiley face emoticon here for the humor impaired.)

73 es GM from Jeff

Amateur: WA6FWI@WA6FWI.#SOCA.CA.USA.NA	"It is difficult to imagine our
Internet: jangus@skyld.tele.com	universe run by a single omni-
US Mail: PO Box 4425 Carson, CA 90749	potent god. I see it more as a
Phone: 1 (310) 324-6080	badly run corporation."

-----  
Date: Wed, 6 Oct 1993 17:01:38 GMT  
From: psinntp!isc-newsserver!rit!sunsrvr6!djw@uunet.uu.net  
Subject: Knight SpanMaster  
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

Hi there folks,

I was wondering if anyone out there knows anything about a receiver manufactured by Allied Radio (of Chicago, Ill) called a "Knight Spanmaster". It has 4 bands, and it looks like it receives from ~1.6Mhz - ~30Mhz. It is missing the tubes (it takes 2 different sized tubes).

Does anybody have any literature on this receiver they would like to copy and send to me? Anybody have an idea on what tubes I need to get for this receiver?

The price was right (free!), and I'd like to fire it up to see if it works, however without tubes, it's a worthless dust collector.

If you could reply via email, I would appreciate it as I'm quite backed up with my newsgroups (what can I say, work calls!). Thanks in advance.

Dave

-----  
Date: Thu, 7 Oct 1993 16:23:47 GMT  
From: mdisea!mothost!lmpsbbs!news@uunet.uu.net  
Subject: MOTOROLA  
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

In article 1@matrix.cs.wright.edu, isoper@matrix.cs.wright.edu writes:  
{Motorola's concerns over this issue are deeply rooted. I worked in the  
{two way radio back in the early 1970's, Motorola had just started to  
{release two-way radios taken in on trade. This was according to the my local  
{National Service Organization Center (as they were called back then),  
{previously the equipment traded in was center to a central location to  
{prevent resale to small businesses thus eliminating one source of  
{competition for the Motorola sales people. Motorola has always been quick  
{to guard their market of "add ons" for their equipment as well.  
{They are very profit oriented, and at loss as to what to do with invasion  
{of third party vendors that have sprung up since the 1980's.  
{  
{At least that's how I view the situation at hand.  
{  
{73 Wes, WB8CEH

You would be amazed at how many niche markets they have allowed small companies to take over, therefore your statement isn't entirely correct.

Bruce, WB4YUC, e1 YUCC0. . .

-----  
Date: Thu, 7 Oct 1993 16:29:36 GMT  
From: mdisea!mothost!lmpsbbs!news@uunet.uu.net  
Subject: Motorola ad in QST?  
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

In article 17733@hemlock.cray.com, dadams@cray.com (David Adams) writes:  
{In article 29654@lmpsbbs.comm.mot.com, burke\_br@adcae1.comm.mot.com (Bruce Burke Sp App) writes:

```
}|
}|
}|The firmware is all copyrighted, tampering with it is a crime!
}|
}|Bruce, WB4YUC
}|
}|
}|
}
```

I updated this in a follow-up posting - something got lost in the finger to computer interface here. . .

```
}
}|Lotus might be able to sue if others sell unlicensed copies of their software,
}|but they can't prevent third party companies from selling software with
}|the same look and feel to be used in it's place.
}|
```

Oh yes they can and oh yes they have. . . not necessarily Lotus, but there have been sucessful lawsuits based on this exact issue. . .

Bruce, WB4YUC, e1 YUCCO. . .

-----  
Date: 6 Oct 1993 18:32:48 GMT  
From: dog.ee.lbl.gov!overload.lbl.gov!agate!howland.reston.ans.net!  
usenet.ins.cwru.edu!slc6!trier@network.ucsd.edu  
Subject: Motorola ad in QST?  
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

In article <1993Oct6.170507.17191@rsd0.rsd.dl.nec.com>,  
<dave@rsd.dl.nec.com> wrote:  
>NO! The copyright laws do not even make copying per se illegal. Copying  
>is only illegal if the intent of the copying is for financial gain, that  
>is, you must make copies and sell them.

This is also wrong. Copying and distribution of a copyrighted work is usually illegal, whether or not money is made. There are specific exceptions granted by the copyright statutes and rulings. The October issue of \_Communications of the ACM\_ has an interesting analysis of the issues and exploration of the grey areas. \_CACM\_ is available in most college libraries.

The article also discussed issues of modification of copyrighted works, and issues of reverse engineering, but not too heavily.

Stephen

I am not a lawyer, and this is not legal advice. It is advice to get information from a lawyer, whether in CACM or in personal consultation.

--

Stephen Trier KB8PWA  
Work: trier@ins.cwru.edu  
Home: sct@po.cwru.edu

My other terminal is an ADM-3A.

: -)

-----  
Date: Wed, 6 Oct 1993 18:47:26 GMT  
From: dog.ee.lbl.gov!agate!howland.reston.ans.net!spool.mu.edu!sgiblab!sgigate!  
odin!odin.corp.sgi.com!watson@network.ucsd.edu  
Subject: Multiband Wire Antenna  
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

I'm getting surprisingly good results from an 80-40-20-15-10 shortened dipole only 42' long. It's hung at about a 120 degree inverted V, inside my attic due to terrible deed restrictions. It's about 25 feet above the ground. There isn't too much metal in my attic and the shingles are wood.

This antenna was built by W9INN antennas (who advertise in QST and elsewhere). It is well designed and tunes easily -- but I'm sure it almost always does require some tuning to get the resonance points exactly right. I use an AEA HF analyst to view the SWR graph across frequency ranges. That's an incredibly useful device. It costs over \$300 but is one of those things like scopes and tube testers that are easily shared between several people.

As you might expect, the low bands are very narrow -- I think the 2:1 SWR is only about 37KHz wide on 80M -- but with a little MFJ tuner I'm getting a signal out very satisfactorily.

I'm very happy with this antenna and with W9INN's service.

-David.  
KE6BWJ

-----  
Date: Wed, 6 Oct 1993 18:59:31 GMT  
From: dog.ee.lbl.gov!agate!howland.reston.ans.net!math.ohio-state.edu!  
cs.utexas.edu!sdd.hp.com!hpscit.sc.hp.com!news.dtc.hp.com!srngenprp!  
alanb@network.ucsd.edu  
Subject: New HF Rig  
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

Zack Lau (zlau@arrl.org) wrote:

[Intermodulation distortion]

: specifications often aren't relevant to how well a radio  
: works in Europe. They might be if they were measured over a wide  
: variety of tone spacings. But, for single spacing of 20 or 100  
: kHz, you really don't get the information you need to know. An  
: amateur bands only receiver with filters will often outperform  
: a general coverage receiver with better DR/IMD/Intercept numbers,  
: simply because the wider RF filters let too much stuff through,  
: despite the seemingly better IMD/DR/intercept numbers.

Exactly.

: ... A filter that ... reduces the number  
: of these really makes a difference. The ideal solution is a tracking  
: filter--preferably one that doesn't add to the distortion problem.  
: Very expensive (45 kilobuck) receivers can do this.

Or use a simple manual tunable preselector filter like the ones that  
nearly every amateur receiver had in the old tube days. The Drake TR-7  
was Drake's first transceiver with wideband filters in the receiver.  
A data sheet showed IMD third-order intercept as a function of tone  
spacing for the TR-7 and the older tube-type TR-4. The TR-7 was better  
close in, but the TR-4 was much better beyond a few hundred kHz.

There's no technical reason manufacturers couldn't include a tunable  
filter in modern receivers. I guess modern hams are more comfortable  
with a computer-like interface than a (TM) Real Radio. :=(

AL N1AL (The old grouch)

-----

Date: Thu, 07 Oct 93 14:03:39 GMT  
From: netcon!bongo!skyld!jangus@locus.ucla.edu  
Subject: New Products Announcement: BFH-1 & BFH-2  
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

In article <2524@indep1.UUCP> clifto@indep1.UUCP writes:

> I always get a kick out of explaining it. I look the questioner  
> in the eye and say "BFH means 'big hammer'." They stare blankly for  
> a second, then smile broadly... usually.

And if they need instruction on how to use that BFH, they can RTFM.

Amateur: WA6FWI@WA6FWI.#SOCA.CA.USA.NA | "It is difficult to imagine our  
Internet: jangus@skyld.tele.com | universe run by a single omni-  
US Mail: PO Box 4425 Carson, CA 90749 | potent god. I see it more as a  
Phone: 1 (310) 324-6080 | badly run corporation."

-----  
Date: Wed, 6 Oct 1993 19:05:31 +0000  
From: dog.ee.lbl.gov!agate!howland.reston.ans.net!pipex!uknet!demon!  
cix.compulink.co.uk!dplumb@network.ucsd.edu  
Subject: PK88 Eprom TF23PK88 ZIP  
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

I ftp'd the file TF23PK88.ZIP from nic.funet.fi, can anyone tell me what it is, what it does, the advantages etc? I have EPROM blowing facilities here, I just don't want to lost all my NVRAM settings for something that might not be of any use to me!

73 Dave G7MIL @ GB7HSN.#32.GBR.EU

-----  
Date: Wed, 06 Oct 1993 18:46:25 GMT  
From: paperboy.ids.net!anomaly.sbs.com!kd1hz@uunet.uu.net  
Subject: Rote Memorization (was: code tests)  
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

In article <28uvbn\$1h@news.acns.nwu.edu>,  
lapin@casbah.acns.nwu.edu (Gregory Lapin) writes:

|> That's an interesting twist - my 10 year old daughter took to Morse Code  
|> like a fish to water. I was amazing to watch. I've heard the same about  
|> other kids. The written was another story. She did not have the basic  
|> science or math background (or even, in come questions, the vocabulary) to  
|> learn the subjects included in the Novice written (Element 2), much less  
|> the Tech written (Element 3a).

Yeah, I always get a kick out of those stories in QST:  
"4 YEAR OLD PASSES EXTRA!"

Can you say "rote memorization"? Good, I knew you could.

|> I've never been able to distinguish a no-code Tech license from one with  
|> code - in fact, the FCC can't either. The only way to tell if someone has  
|> a no code license is if they say so.

There is an easier way to tell. Around here, we just listen to the  
repeater and scan for key phrases like "Yeah, I'm working on my



code".

There is one no-clue bozo in this area who has been "working on his code" for two and a half years now. After the first 18 months, he decided that studying the 5 WPM was "too hard", and decided to study at the 13WPM level instead, which was "easier". At the last VE session, when he failed his 13WPM test for the 10th time (obviously he's going for the "I guessed right on 7 out of 10!!!" method) he asked the VE team for a "refund".

Yup, around here, its really easy to pick out the no-clues on the local 2-meter good-buddy box.

MD

```
--
-- Michael P. Deignan, KD1HZ -
-- Internet: kd1hz@anomaly.sbs.com - Providence Firefighters Association:
-- UUCP: ...!uunet!anomaly!kd1hz - We Find 'Em Hot, And Leave 'Em Wet
-- AT&TNet: 401-273-4669 -
```

-----

Date: Wed, 6 Oct 1993 15:13:39 GMT  
From: news.uiowa.edu!icaen.uiowa.edu!drenze@uunet.uu.net  
Subject: RS SWR meters?  
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

Can anybody give me a quick hint...just how good are the Radio Shack (well, built by micronata) SWR meters (art numbers 21-523 and 21-524). Are they worth my money? Looks as if they cover 80-10m to me, no?

```
--
__ /| | Douglas J Renze, N0YVW | Charter Member, Popular Front
\'o.O' | +1 319 337 4664 | for Revolutionary Darwinism:
=(___)= | drenze@icaen.uiowa.edu |
U | Douglas-Renze@uiowa.edu | Evolution Now!
```

-----

Date: Thu, 07 Oct 93 13:59:42 GMT  
From: netcon!bongo!skyld!janguis@locus.ucla.edu  
Subject: Speech Inversion Mod Needed  
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

In article <horak.749956082@convex.convex.com> horak@convex.com writes:

```
> I would like to build or buy a device that will un-invert speech
> inversion.
```

MX-Com makes chips to do this at a reasonable price.  
1 (800) 638-5577

Great bunch of simple inversion to rolling code multiple scrambler chips.

Amateur: WA6FWI@WA6FWI.#SOCA.CA.USA.NA		"It is difficult to imagine our
Internet: jangus@skyld.tele.com		universe run by a single omni-
US Mail: PO Box 4425 Carson, CA 90749		potent god. I see it more as a
Phone: 1 (310) 324-6080		badly run corporation."

-----  
Date: 7 Oct 93 21:06:33 GMT  
From: ogicse!uwm.edu!msuinfo!netnews.upenn.edu!mipg.upenn.edu!yee@network.ucsd.edu  
Subject: Standards in 12V power cords.  
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

It has been awhile since this thread has passed around and the last time,  
I don't think anyone answered this question to my satisfaction.

The ARRL recommends the Molex 1545-series connector (last discussed  
QST 8/93 p. 50)

My question is why? While fine for HT's, the current ratings on the Molex  
aren't quite up to the needs of a 100W class HF transciever. The article  
in QST didn't explain the design decisions which caused the ARRL to decide  
upon upon the Molex connectors. What were the disadvantages of other common  
connectors (e.g. Jones) and what were the advantages of the Molex?

--  
411 Blockley Hall | Conway Yee, N2JWQ  
418 Service Drive | yee@mipg.upenn.edu  
Philadelphia, PA 19104 |  
(215) 662-6780 |

-----  
Date: 6 Oct 1993 18:12:19 GMT  
From: dog.ee.lbl.gov!agate!spool.mu.edu!news.clark.edu!netnews.nwnet.net!  
news.uoregon.edu!fp2-st-affairs-11.uoregon.edu!user@network.ucsd.edu  
Subject: ZD9SXW & 3D2AW QSL routes?  
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

Does anyone know the QSL routes for these guys?

Thanks,  
Steve/AA7FL

-----  
Date: Wed, 6 Oct 1993 18:17:33 GMT  
From: news.bu.edu!att!cbnewsm!jeffj@decwrl.dec.com  
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

References <1993Oct5.151123.16722@ke4zv.atl.ga.us>,  
<CEfyBp.30y@cbnewsm.cb.att.com>, <1993Oct6.160449.14770@rsg1.er.usgs.gov>~  
Subject : Re: Codeless Tech Debate

In article <1993Oct6.160449.14770@rsg1.er.usgs.gov> bodoh@dgg.cr.usgs.gov (Tom Bodoh) writes:

>You state that as fact, but it is only an opinion. The facts are;  
> It has been an integral part of Ham radio since it's inception.  
True

> It's popularity is waning.

Not true and the crowded conditions down at the bottom end of the bands don't support your argument at all. Time and time again I have a hard time finding a spot to call CQ on the CW portions of the band. When I hear plenty of room every night on CW in which to call CQ I will agree with you then. The truth is there is NOT enough room on CW for everyone to operate! This is a fallacy that the anti-CW types keep desperately trying to get everyone to believe. Tell a big enough lie and everyone will believe it.

> Other countries are dropping it.

Not true, Only Japan and it gets around it with limiting power to 10 watts.

> Newer modes of operation are quickly overtaking it in popularity.

Not true and it's more like they are taking each other over in popularity.

> No-coders are treated as whiners simply because they are forward  
> looking and would rather spend the time on becoming familiar  
> with other modes.

Now that is NOT true, most No-coders would rather talk on their 2 meter handhelds then make any effort at going at the other modes. However this true of the other parts of amateur radio. The satellites are wide open (DX+) to the no-code techs and I don't exactly see them flooding them with

their calls. It's still a matter of wanting something for nothing. I still support the no-code license but I am not as enthusiastic about it as I once was. All I see is this pattern, first no-code, then tests are too hard, then no tests and then CB worldwide at it's finest. The fact is that CW and Amateur Radio were here first before the no-codes showed up. To no one's great surprise the no-codes are screaming about getting access to the HF bands with no real effort on their part. If they eliminate the CW requirement (they will someday) and I imagine in their infinite wisdom make the tests even easier, I just can't wait to what happens to HF. CB is a good case for what can happen when you do exactly what everyone seems to want. No code, no test and no quality! As a matter of fact CB is the perfect place! It has no code, no test and you can operate worldwide with it (FCC gave up). It is exactly what everyone wants! However for some reason (I can't imagine why) CB is garbage. Kinda proves my point doesn't it!

Jeff (playing the devil's advocate) Jones

--

Jeff Jones AB6MB		OPPOSE THE NORTH AMERICAN FREE TRADE AGREEMENT!
jeffj@seeker.mystic.com		Canada/USA Free Trade cost Canada 400,000 jobs.
Infolinc BBS 510-778-5929		Want to guess how many we'll lose to Mexico?

-----

Date: 7 Oct 93 09:31:38 GMT  
From: news.Hawaii.Edu!uhunix3.uhcc.Hawaii.Edu!jherman@ames.arpa  
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

References <CDrxvA.JDJ@news.Hawaii.Edu>,  
<19930ct4.142552.23058@cyphyn.radnet.com>,  
<19930ct6.011651.19403@ringer.cs.utsa.edu>.Hawa  
Subject : Re: HTs Airlines and Morris

In article <19930ct6.011651.19403@ringer.cs.utsa.edu> dlaro@lonestar.utsa.edu (David O. Laro) writes:  
>In article <19930ct4.142552.23058@cyphyn.radnet.com> randy@cyphyn.radnet.com (Randy) writes:  
>>Jeff Herman (jherman@uhunix3.uhcc.Hawaii.Edu) wrote:  
>>: In article <748711640snx@skyld.tele.com> jangus@skyld.tele.com (Jeffrey D. Angus) writes:  
>>: >  
>>: >In article <27o3fjINNro8@topaz.bds.com> ron@topaz.bds.com writes:  
>>: >  
>>: > [ apparently quoting jangus@skyld.tele.com ]  
>>: > >  
>>: > > The Captain did come on the intercom and announce that "transmitting  
>>: > > devices" were not allowed to be energized while the plane was in the

>>: > > air due to FAA regulations. (They did not cite which regulations in  
>>: > >  
>>: > Section 91.21. Why do you insist on causing trouble?  
>>: >  
>>:  
>>: Did you really mean to call the pilot of that aircraft a 'petty bureaucrat'?  
>>:  
>>: Someone correct me if I'm wrong (what a silly thing to say on this net...)  
>>: but I believe a pilot may implement, within reason, any policy which he/she  
>>: feels is necessary for the safety of the aircraft, regardless of the standing  
>>: policies imposed by the company. If that pilot believes that transmitting  
>>: devices might, no matter how small the chance, interfere with navigation,  
>>: then I am very glad that he would say something.  
>>:  
>>: Jeff NH6IL (ex: WA6QIJ et al)  
>  
>>You are not wrong...and it's more than that, too.  
>>  
>>Using a transmitter....even many receivers ( the local oscillator, is why)  
>>inside an aeroplane, you are right next to the antenna system...the body of  
>> the craft is part of the system.  
>>  
>>Someone sending, or even receiving, will screw up the navigation gear,  
>>(which relies heavily on radio), plus the collision avoidance systems.  
>  
>Maybe this would be completely accurate if you'd change "will screw up"  
>to "may...." (well, HE said to correct him if he was wrong and then you  
>come along and ....you know)  
>  
>Now that we're informed, we (royal 'we') believe that the pilot was  
>actually a benefactor of all the people on that flight. further, to  
>get irritated at the pilot for saying that is closely akin to the passenger  
>who gets irate when his pilot delays takeoff to repair an intermittent  
>engine problem on a Boeing 707. I \*like\* petty pilots like that.  
>  
>David kb5nz  
>

Since both newsgroups, r.r.amateur.misc and r.r.scanner are currently  
carrying on this same debate (and in fact, for those of you reading  
this on r.r.a.misc, someone flying in an airplane used a portable  
laptop/packet/2M xcvr to post an article on r.r.scanner telling everyone  
the plane he was in hadn't crashed yet), I thought it would be nice  
to crosspost this thread (I doubt if many of the scanner folks read  
r.r.a.m). This way the scanner people can read the hams' perspective  
of this topic.

Jeff NH6IL (back in the horse and buggy days: WA6QIJ)

-----

End of Info-Hams Digest V93 #1190

\*\*\*\*\*